

Under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number.

PRE-APPEAL BRIEF REQUEST FOR REVIEW		Docket Number (Optional) 03-637
I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to "Mail Stop AF, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450" [37 CFR 1.8(a)] on _____ Signature _____ Typed or printed name _____	Application Number 10/622,146	Filed July 16, 2003
	First Named Inventor Tom McCarthy	
	Art Unit 3685	Examiner Cristina O. Sherr

Applicant requests review of the final rejection in the above-identified application. No amendments are being filed with this request.

This request is being filed with a notice of appeal.

The review is requested for the reason(s) stated on the attached sheet(s).

Note: No more than five (5) pages may be provided.

I am the

applicant/inventor.
 assignee of record of the entire interest.
 See 37 CFR 3.71. Statement under 37 CFR 3.73(b) is enclosed.
 (Form PTO/SB/96)
 attorney or agent of record.
 Registration number 39,269
 attorney or agent acting under 37 CFR 1.34.
 Registration number if acting under 37 CFR 1.34 _____.

/George I. Lee/

Signature

George I. Lee

Typed or printed name

312-913-0001

Telephone number

November 22, 2010

Date

NOTE: Signatures of all the inventors or assignees of record of the entire interest or their representative(s) are required.
 Submit multiple forms if more than one signature is required, see below*.

<input type="checkbox"/>	*Total of _____ forms are submitted.
--------------------------	--------------------------------------

This collection of information is required by 35 U.S.C. 132. The information is required to obtain or retain a benefit by the public which is to file (and by the USPTO to process) an application. Confidentiality is governed by 35 U.S.C. 122 and 37 CFR 1.11, 1.14 and 41.6. This collection is estimated to take 12 minutes to complete, including gathering, preparing, and submitting the completed application form to the USPTO. Time will vary depending upon the individual case. Any comments on the amount of time you require to complete this form and/or suggestions for reducing this burden, should be sent to the Chief Information Officer, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, U.S. Department of Commerce, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450. DO NOT SEND FEES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS. SEND TO: Mail Stop AF, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

If you need assistance in completing the form, call 1-800-PTO-9199 and select option 2.

Privacy Act Statement

The **Privacy Act of 1974 (P.L. 93-579)** requires that you be given certain information in connection with your submission of the attached form related to a patent application or patent. Accordingly, pursuant to the requirements of the Act, please be advised that: (1) the general authority for the collection of this information is 35 U.S.C. 2(b)(2); (2) furnishing of the information solicited is voluntary; and (3) the principal purpose for which the information is used by the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office is to process and/or examine your submission related to a patent application or patent. If you do not furnish the requested information, the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office may not be able to process and/or examine your submission, which may result in termination of proceedings or abandonment of the application or expiration of the patent.

The information provided by you in this form will be subject to the following routine uses:

1. The information on this form will be treated confidentially to the extent allowed under the Freedom of Information Act (5 U.S.C. 552) and the Privacy Act (5 U.S.C. 552a). Records from this system of records may be disclosed to the Department of Justice to determine whether disclosure of these records is required by the Freedom of Information Act.
2. A record from this system of records may be disclosed, as a routine use, in the course of presenting evidence to a court, magistrate, or administrative tribunal, including disclosures to opposing counsel in the course of settlement negotiations.
3. A record in this system of records may be disclosed, as a routine use, to a Member of Congress submitting a request involving an individual, to whom the record pertains, when the individual has requested assistance from the Member with respect to the subject matter of the record.
4. A record in this system of records may be disclosed, as a routine use, to a contractor of the Agency having need for the information in order to perform a contract. Recipients of information shall be required to comply with the requirements of the Privacy Act of 1974, as amended, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552a(m).
5. A record related to an International Application filed under the Patent Cooperation Treaty in this system of records may be disclosed, as a routine use, to the International Bureau of the World Intellectual Property Organization, pursuant to the Patent Cooperation Treaty.
6. A record in this system of records may be disclosed, as a routine use, to another federal agency for purposes of National Security review (35 U.S.C. 181) and for review pursuant to the Atomic Energy Act (42 U.S.C. 218(c)).
7. A record from this system of records may be disclosed, as a routine use, to the Administrator, General Services, or his/her designee, during an inspection of records conducted by GSA as part of that agency's responsibility to recommend improvements in records management practices and programs, under authority of 44 U.S.C. 2904 and 2906. Such disclosure shall be made in accordance with the GSA regulations governing inspection of records for this purpose, and any other relevant (i.e., GSA or Commerce) directive. Such disclosure shall not be used to make determinations about individuals.
8. A record from this system of records may be disclosed, as a routine use, to the public after either publication of the application pursuant to 35 U.S.C. 122(b) or issuance of a patent pursuant to 35 U.S.C. 151. Further, a record may be disclosed, subject to the limitations of 37 CFR 1.14, as a routine use, to the public if the record was filed in an application which became abandoned or in which the proceedings were terminated and which application is referenced by either a published application, an application open to public inspection or an issued patent.
9. A record from this system of records may be disclosed, as a routine use, to a Federal, State, or local law enforcement agency, if the USPTO becomes aware of a violation or potential violation of law or regulation.

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
(Case No. 03-637)

In the Application of:)
Tom McCarthy, et al.)
Serial No.: 10/622,146) Examiner: Cristina O. Sherr
Filing Date: July 16, 2003) Group Art Unit: 3685
For: Method and Apparatus for Distributing) Confirmation No.: 1889
Media in a Pay Per Play Architecture)
with Remote Playback)

Mail Stop AF
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

PRE-APPEAL BRIEF REQUEST FOR REVIEW

Dear Examiners:

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the Final Office Action mailed May 21, 2010 and Advisory Action of November 3, 2010.

I. STATUS OF THE APPLICATION

Currently pending are claims 1-13 and 27-40 of which claim 1 is independent and the remainder of the claims are dependent. Claims 14-26, 41-44 and 46-83 were previously withdrawn and claim 45 was previously cancelled.

In the Final Office Action mailed May 21, 2010, the Examiner rejected claims 1-13 and 27-40 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. 5,659,350 ("Hendricks") in view of EP 1 100 266 A2 ("Gaske").

II. DEFICIENCIES IN THE REJECTION TO THE CLAIMS

The Examiner's rejections are clearly in error for at least the reason that Hendricks in view of Gaske does not show Applicants' claimed "discovery service" to search for content and download content based on a content profile. Applicants submit that the remarks set forth in its response filed July 21, 2010 explains clearly why the rejection of the claims was in error. Applicants thus respectfully request the panel review those remarks, which are incorporated herein by reference, and consider the additional remarks below.

Applicants have examined each of the Examiner's citations to Hendricks alleged to disclose a "discovery service" and shown the factual error that these citations do not actually disclose a "discovery service." The Advisory Office Action, however, does not address Applicants' showing of why Hendricks does not disclose a "discovery service."

A. Hendricks Does Not Disclose A "Discovery Service" to "Search for Stored Media Content and to Download Content Based On a Content Profile"

The Hendricks prior art creates on-screen program *menus* from which *the viewer selects* programs he/she wishes to watch. Hendricks "acquires viewer information on programs watched" to create an "individualized program lineup" for the viewer. Col. 3, lines 59-65. Hendricks' "menus" are "displayed on a subscriber's television by using an array of menu templates." Col. 11, lines 3-4. The subscriber can "sequence through subsequent menus" that "guide the subscriber to the selection of his choice." Col. 12, lines 63-68. The menus, however, *rely on the viewer to search for and select programming* to be downloaded and viewed.

As a result, Hendricks does not disclose a discovery service, but rather relies on the viewer to search for and select programming for download from the program menus. As the user finds and selects programming for download, Hendricks does not disclose a "discovery service"

to search for “content and to download content based on a content profile” as in claim 1. Rather, it is the viewer—not a “discovery service”—that searches for and downloads content.

The Examiner’s rejection relies on Hendricks columns 9, lines 62-66, column 15, lines 28-55 and column 16, lines 36-45 as disclosing the claimed “discovery service.”

4. Applicant argues, regarding claim 1, as currently amended, that nothing in the cited prior teaches, discloses or suggests “a discovery service, provided on the first or second platform operable to search for stored media content and to download content based on a content profile.”

5. Examiner respectfully disagrees. Attention is directed to Hendricks at col 9 ln 66-62. Also, col 15 ln 28-55 col 16 ln 10-22, col 16 ln 36-45.

Final Office Action, May 21, 2010, page 2. Despite the Examiner’s reliance, these citations do not disclose a “discovery service” that both searches for and downloads content. Applicants’ response to the Final Office Action points out in detail the deficiencies of each of the Examiner’s citations to Hendricks, which the Examiner has not responded.

1. Column 9 of Hendricks Does Not Disclose a “Discovery Service”

Column 9 of Hendricks does not disclose a “discovery service.” Rather, it refers to network controller 214 that “enables the delivery system to adapt the specific requirements of the individual set top terminals 220.” The passage explains this enables “on the fly programming” changes to provide specialized TV services such as split screen, interactive TV, etc., not a discovery service to search for and download content:

In other words, the network controller 214 is able to perform ‘on the fly programming’ changes. With this capability, the network controller 214 can handle sophisticated local programming needs such as, for example, interactive television, split screen video and selection of different foreign languages for the same video.

Col. 9, line 66-col. 10, line 7.

Thus, column 9 of Hendricks does not disclose Applicants' claimed discovery service to search for and download content based on a content profile.

2. Column 15 of Hendricks Does Not Disclose a "Discovery Service"

Similarly, the Examiner's citation to columns 15 of Hendricks also does not disclose a "discovery service." Column 15, lines 28-55 refer to "the retrieval of viewer data" obtained "from set top terminals" and "then filtering and presenting the data" in the on-screen menu. Col. 15, lines 32-34. The raw data includes "programs a user purchased and when," "what channel a specific user watched and for how long." The retrieved viewer data is used to calculate "How many viewers watched a particular program," "Peak viewing times for different categories of shows," and "Buy rates for particular menu positions." Col. 15, lines 41-55. This information is then used for "Menu creation, both automatically and manually." Col. 15, line 51.

Contrary to the Examiner's citation, column 15 of Hendricks also does not disclose a "discovery service" searching and downloading programming content as called for by Applicants' claims. The cited passage is for "retrieval of viewer data" obtained "from set top terminals" to creating programming menus to display to viewers.

3. Column 16 of Hendricks Does Not Disclose a "Discovery Service"

Similarly, the Examiner's citation to column 16 also does not disclose a "discovery service." In fact, the cited passage is directed toward an "Executive Information System" to provide TV executives "an online software tool that will allow for the real-time evaluation of current product positioning" where TV executives are provided with "friendly icons" to provide "general information on the current programming sales status" without a "long learning curve and information overload." Col. 16, lines 35-44. The "graphical tools allow for analysis of current data through the use of multiple graph tool types such as line graphs, bar and pie charts.

Col. 16, lines 45-47. A discovery service for downloading program content based on a profile is not disclosed.

Paragraph 12 of the Final Rejection also argues that Hendricks discloses “downloading content based on a content profile, (e.g., col. 16, lines 45-53).” Final Office Action, May 21, 2010, page 4. Again, the cited passage describes the Executive Information System to enable a TV executive to create menus with the programming mix in the allotted time slots—it does not discuss a “discovery service” to search for and download actual program content.

B. The Gaske Prior Art Also Does Not Disclose Or Suggest The Claimed Discovery Service

In addition, the cited Gaske prior art is also absent the claimed “discovery service.” Gaske does not disclose or suggest a service that searches for and downloads content based on a content profile.

As such, because the references, either alone or in combination, do not show all the elements of independent claim 1, claim 1 is allowable. All the remaining pending claims 2-13 and 27-40, being dependent on claim 1 are also allowable as well.

CONCLUSION

Given the clear error in rejecting claims 1-13 and 27-40, Applicants respectfully request that the panel withdraw the rejections and direct that a notice of allowance be mailed.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: November 22, 2010

By: /George I. Lee/
George I. Lee
Registration No. 39,269